DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 092 CE 012 149

AUTHOR	Wright, Calvin E.; Kim, Yungho
TITLE	An Evaluation of Projects Funded by the State of California under Title I, Parts C and D, of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.
INSTITUTION	Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc., Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Div. of Occupational Education.; California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Vocational Education Services ; Stanislaus County Superintendent of Schools, Modesto, Calif.
REPORT NO	76-405-08
BUREAU NO	50-10504-C-6-010
PUB DATE	Dec 76
NOTE	59p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Demonstration Projects; Educational Finance; *Educational Planning; *Federal Aid; Post Secondary Education; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Research Projects; Secondary Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*California; Vocational Education Amendments 1968

ABSTRACT

Seventy-eight federally funded California vocational education projects were evaluated to provide information on which to base plans for future research and exemplary program policies and procedures in vocational education. Objectives of the evaluation were to (1) provide information for future planning of administration of funds; (2) determine if project results and outcomes were consistent with project objectives; (3) determine how results of the project benefited vocational education students; (4) prepare written descriptions of the project products; (5) document lasting effects which resulted; and (6) determine whether further dissemination of project outcomes is desirable. It was concluded that most of the projects were successful, though the number of students served seemed relatively small and evidence of direct benefits was not particularly convincing. However, a number of projects seemed to have significance at the state or national level. Thirteen recommendations were offered, the major one being that the California State Plan for Education should either be followed or it should be changed. (Projects included in the study and for which summaries were prepared are listed in the appendix of this report. Supplementary tables are also appended.) (BL)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED145092

76-405-08

Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc.
250 S. CASTANYA WAY
MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA 94025
(415) 325-3254

AN EVALUATION OF PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA UNDER TITLE I, PARTS C AND D, OF THE VOCATIONAL FDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968

Calvin E. Wright and Yungho Kim

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared For

Vocational Education Support Unit
California State Department of Education

and

Division of Occupational Education
California Community Colleges

CE 012 149

December 1976

This study was supported by Public Law 90-576 funds through a grant to the Office of the Stanislaus County Superintendent of Schools, Project No. 50-10504-C-6-010.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of an evaluation of California vocational education projects supported by grants or contracts made under Part C or Part D of Public Law 90-576 during the period July 1, 1972, through July 10, 1975. The purpose of the evaluation was to provide information on which to base plans for future research and exemplary program policies and procedures in the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges and in the Vocational Education Support Unit of the Department of Education.

Five types of activities were undertaken for this study. First, applications for funds, reports, and other project information were obtained and reviewed. A total of 40 Part C and 38 Part D projects was identified. An information request was sent to an individual knowledgeable about each of the projects, and state staff were interviewed. Visits were also made to the sites of 15 Part C and eight Part D projects to talk with project staff and participants, and to inspect tangible project outcomes. Two-page summaries were then prepared for each of the 78 projects based upon all information available. Information from all sources was then summarized and analyzed for this report.

The specific objectives of the study, and the general findings or accomplishments for each, are presented below.

1. To provide information that can serve as a basis for future planning for the use and administration of funds available from Parts C and D of P.L. 90-576 or its amendment.

This report provides considerable information that can serve as a basis for the future planning for the use and administration of funds. The results of the study are presented and discussed, as appropriate, in seven sections: background and general information, project administration and management, purposes and activities of the projects, project outcomes, evidence of effectiveness, dissemination and adoption, and significance for vocational education. A number of conclusions are presented and recommendations are offered. One major recommendation is that the California State Plan for Vocational Education should either be followed, or it should be changed. The improvement of procedures is another theme in the recommendations. In addition, it is recommended that serious consideration be given to whether the policies and procedures for awarding and managing Part C and Part D funds should be the same for the State Department of Education and the Community Colleges.

2. To determine if project results and outcomes were consistent with project objectives, and to obtain an explanation for any variations.

Although there were some exceptions, project results and outcomes were generally consistent with project objectives. In cases where they were not, late funding was often the cause. In addition, project objectives were often poorly written and evaluation was often not focused on the objectives. These factors plus poor reporting often made it appear that results and outcomes were not consistent with objectives.

3. To determine what resulted from the projects, and document how the results were used to directly benefit vocational and occupational education students.

The results of each project and the products produced are noted in the summary that was prepared for each project, and they are discussed in the text of this report. Most of the projects funded did not directly benefit vocational and occupational education students, although a number of them had indirect student benefits. However, it should be noted that the priorities used to guide funding decisions were not always oriented to students. For those projects claiming direct benefits to students, the evidence that there were such benefits was often inadequate. These findings are similar to those reported recently by the national Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development in Assessing Vocational Education Research and Development.

4. To prepare written descriptions of the products of past research projects which might be usable to vocational educators in selecting materials and equipment, introducing innovative or effective teaching methods, improving management functions, and defining problems and designing solutions for future projects.

A two-page summary was prepared for each of the 78 projects. Each summary addressed the purpose of the project, results, products produced, evidence of effectiveness, dissemination and adoption, and significance for vocational education. Submitted separately from this report, a list of the summaries that were prepared is given in Appendix A.

5. For Part D exemplary grants, to document lasting effects which resulted. This will include recording evidence of the dissemination of ideas, products, and other materials to organizations not receiving grants, as well as lasting effects to the recipient organization.

This objective was addressed for both Part C and Part D projects. Project effectiveness and dissemination and adoption were major issues considered both during the site visits and on the information request sent to project staff. It was found that there were few differences between Part C and Part D projects as far as dissemination activities were concerned. Also, the fact that more Part C than Part D projects resulted in new projects leads one to question the extent to which Part D projects were "exemplary and innovative." Some problems were encountered in documenting the lasting effects which resulted from projects, due in large part to the fact that project staff did not maintain such records, especially after a project was completed.

6. To determine whether further dissemination of exemplary project outcomes is desirable.

It was concluded that the further dissemination of selected project outcomes and information about both Part C and Part D projects would appear to be highly desirable. The word "selected" is used since some project outcomes or products are of doubtful value and dissemination of them would be difficult to justify. It was also recommended that the state develop a formal system to disseminate the results and products of completed projects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	v
Introduction	1
Purpose and Objectives	1
Approach	2
Allowable Uses of Part C and Part D funds	2
Method	4
Obtain Reports and Project Information	4
Obtain Additional Information From Projects and State Personnel	5
Visit Selected Project Sites	5
Prepare Project Summaries	6
Analyze and Reduce Data	6
Results and Discussion	8
Background and General Information	8
Project Administration and Management	12
Purposes and Activities of the Projects	18
Project Outcomes	18
Evidence of Effectiveness	20
Dissemination and Adoption	23
Significance for Vocational Education	25
Conclusions and Recommendations	27
Conclusions	27
Recommendations	29
References	32
Appendices	33
A. Projects Included in Study and for Which Summaries Were Prepared	33
B. Supplementary Tables	40
C. Information Requests and Cover Letter	(Bound Separately)
D. Site Visit Instruments	(Bound Separately)

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Funds Committed by Year	9
2	Number of Part C Awards Made and Funds Committed by Type of Recipient	10
3	Number of Part D Awards Made and Funds Committed by Type of Recipient	10
4	Significance of Part C and Part D Project Outcomes for Vocational Education	26

INTRODUCTION

Parts C and D of Title I of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (Public Law 90-576) provide for two of the sources of funds for vocational education projects in the State of California. Section 131(b) of Part C provides that funds available to each state be used by its state board, in accordance with its state plan, for grants or contracts for: research and training programs; experimental, developmental, or pilot programs designed to meet the special vocational needs of youths; and the dissemination of information derived from the foregoing programs or from research and demonstrations in the field of vocational education. Section 142(d) of Part D provides for the use of funds for grants or contracts to carry out the development, establishment, and operation of exemplary and innovative occupational education programs or projects designed to serve as models for use in vocational education programs. This report presents the results of an evaluation of California vocational education projects supported by grants or contracts made under Part C or Part D during the period July 1, 1972, through July 10, 1975.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the evaluation of Part C and Part D projects was to provide information on which to base plans for future research and exemplary program policies and procedures in the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges and in the Vocational Education Support Unit of the Department of Education. The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To provide information that can serve as a basis for future planning for the use and administration of funds available from Parts C and D of P.L. 90-576 or its amendment.

2. To determine if project results and outcomes were consistent with project objectives, and to obtain an explanation for any variations.

3. To determine what resulted from the projects, and document how the results were used to directly benefit vocational and occupational education students.

4. To prepare written descriptions of the products of past research projects which might be usable to vocational educators in selecting materials and equipment, introducing innovative or effective teaching methods, improving management functions, and defining problems and designing solutions for future projects.

5. For Part D exemplary grants, to document lasting effects which

resulted. This will include recording evidence of the dissemination of ideas, products, and other materials to organizations not receiving grants, as well as lasting effects to the recipient organization.

6. To determine whether further dissemination of exemplary project outcomes is desirable.

Approach

Five types of activities were undertaken in this study. First, reports and other project information were obtained from the State Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges. A total of 40 Part C and 38 Part D projects funded between July 1, 1972, and July 10, 1975, were identified. An information request was then sent to an individual knowledgeable about each of the projects in order to obtain more current information than would appear in a written report of a project. Staff in the Vocational Education Support Unit of the Department of Education and in the Division of Occupational Education of the California Community Colleges were also interviewed. Visits were made to the sites of 15 Part C projects and eight Part D projects in order to talk with project staff and participants as appropriate. Tangible project outcomes were also inspected. Based upon all information available, a two-page summary was prepared for each of the 78 projects. Each summary noted the purpose of the project, results, products produced, evidence of effectiveness, dissemination and adoption, and significance for vocational education. Information from all sources was then summarized and analyzed for this report. Greater detail about the method and procedures used is presented below.

Allowable Uses of Part C and Part D Funds

As noted above, Public Law 90-576 authorizes the use of Part C funds for: research and training programs; experimental, developmental, or pilot programs designed to meet the special vocational needs of youth; and the dissemination of information derived from the foregoing programs or from research and demonstrations in the field of vocational education. More specifically, section 132 of Part C states that the funds can be used for:

1. Research in vocational education.

2. Training programs designed to familiarize persons involved in vocational education with research findings and successful pilot and demonstration projects in vocational education.

3. Experimental, developmental, and pilot programs and projects designed to test the effectiveness of research findings.

4. Demonstration and dissemination projects.

5. The development of new vocational education curricula.

6. Projects in the development of new careers and occupations.

Part D funds are to be used to carry out the development, establishment, and operation of exemplary and innovative occupational education programs or projects designed to serve as models for use in vocational education programs. According to section 143(a) of Part D of P.L. 90-576, the funds may be used for:

1. Planning and developing exemplary programs or projects.

2. Establishing, operating, or evaluating exemplary programs or projects designed to carry out the purposes of Part D and to broaden occupational aspirations and opportunities for youths.

The purposes of Part D are to stimulate new ways to create a bridge between school and earning a living for young people, and to promote cooperation between public education and manpower agencies. Programs or projects that can be supported with Part D funds include those designed to broaden or improve vocational education curriculum.

As originally planned, this report was to have separate sections addressing Part C and Part D projects. However, Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc., (EERI) staff found that, in the nature of the projects, there were few differences between those funded by Part C and those funded by Part D. Also, a review of the allowable uses of Part C and Part D funds as given above shows considerable overlap. The overlap was, in addition, pointed out recently by the national Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development, which noted that all activities specified under Part D can also be conducted under Part C (CVERD, 1976, p. 21). Given the similarity between Part C and Part D projects, it appeared more fruitful to discuss them together rather than separately.

METHOD

This section reports on the five major activities carried out to complete the evaluation of the Part C and Part D projects: obtain reports and project information; obtain additional information from projects and state personnel; visit selected project sites; prepare project summaries; and analyze and reduce data.

Obtain Reports and Project Information

Arrangements were made with staff from the Vocational Education Support Unit of the State Department of Education and the Division of Occupational Education of the California Community Colleges to obtain information about the projects to be studied and to obtain copies of reports. Generally, copies of applications for funds were obtained for later use by EERI staff. Copies of final reports were also made unless duplicate copies could be borrowed. Financial information from applications, claims for funds, and other documents were recorded on a form especially designed for the purpose.

Some difficulty was experienced in finding out specifically what information was available where, especially for Part D projects. With some exceptions, EERI staff were unable to locate files of or a collection of final reports for Part D projects, although information obtained from the staffs of the projects themselves indicated that such reports were frequently prepared.

The list of projects to be included in the study was initially supplied to EERI by Department of Education staff. It contained 33 Part C projects and 38 Part D projects, all of which had supposedly been funded by June 30, 1975. A review of the funding letter for each project revealed, however, that 10 of the Part D projects had been approved between July 1 and July 10, 1975. Included in the 10 were two projects from Part D funds allotted to the Commissioner of Education under section 142(c) of P.L. 90-576, rather than to the State of California under section 142(d). It was also found that there were seven Part C projects amounting to $367,777 that were funded between July 1, 1972, and June 30, 1975, that were not on the original list. Four of these seven had been awarded to community college districts, two to county offices of education, and one to another state agency. The 10 projects funded after June 30, 1975, were retained in the study, while the seven additional Part C projects were added. The final total was 78 projects, 40 funded under Part C and 38 funded under Part D.

Obtain Additional Information From Projects and State Personnel

A questionnaire was developed and sent to the project recipient organizations. It was used to obtain information of the type not ordinarily found in project reports, such as: evidence of the use of products; evidence of effectiveness obtained since completion of the project; lasting effects to the recipient organization; and whether there were resulting or related projects. A separate Information Request (as the questionnaire was called) was used for Part C and Part D projects, but the questions were essentially identical. A copy of each Information Request and the covering letter sent with them are given in Appendix C. There was some difficulty in finding out whom the Information Request should be mailed to for some of the older projects. After repeated telephone follow-ups as required, a 99% response rate was obtained. An Information Request could not be completed by school district staff for the second year of a three-year Part D project funded in part with Commissioner's funds.

In order to collect additional information about the management of Part C and Part D funds, meetings were held with staff in the Vocational Education Support Unit of the Department of Education and in the Division of Occupational Education of the California Community Colleges. A semistructured interview format was used, with each meeting lasting about an hour.

Visit Selected Project Sites

Visits were made to the sites of 23 projects to investigate them in depth and to verify information from both project reports and the questionnaires. The sites to be visited were selected by the two study monitors, one from the Vocational Education Support Unit of the Department of Education, and one from the Division of Occupational Education of the California Community Colleges. A letter notifying staff at the selected sites about the visits was sent from either the State Department of Education or from the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges.

In approaching the development of data collection plans, procedures, and instrumentation, a list was first made of all of the items of concern or variables that the study was to address. Other concerns expressed by the study monitors or selected from appropriate rules and regulations were then added. The list addressed: background and general administration; project administration and management; purpose and objectives of the project; project activities; project results and products; evidence of effectiveness;

dissemination and adoption; and significance for vocational education. From this list a master list of site visit questions was prepared, and the potential respondent for each question was decided. The potential questions were then asked, in a role playing situation, of an EERI consultant in the vocational education field. As a result and after review of the items by EERI staff and study monitors, further modifications were made in the interview items. Four interview forms were then made from the master list of questions: one for project managers; one for technical staff; one for project participants such as research staff, school principals, administrators, and teachers; and one for students. A form to note materials and activities observed was also prepared. The forms were used for the first site visit, and then modified slightly on the basis of problems encountered. The final versions of the site visit instruments are given in Appendix D.

Prior to the first site visit, EERI site visitors were involved in a training session that lasted approximately a day and a half. During the first few site visits, team members were doubled up on the interviews and they alternately interviewed and observed. Answers recorded by each were subsequently discussed as one method of trying to obtain reliability among the interviewers. Site visits lasted one or two days, depending upon the number of people to be interviewed and the number of materials and activities to be observed.

Prepare Project Summaries

Using all of the information available about a project, a two-page summary was prepared for each of the 78 projects. The seven sections of each summary were: purpose, results, products produced, evidence of effectiveness, dissemination and adoption, significance for vocational education, and whom to contact for further information. Each summary was prepared, reviewed and edited by senior EERI staff, and then sent to the Vocational Education Support Unit of the Department of Education. There they were again edited and sent to an editorial committee for review and comment. Modifications were then made by EERI staff as appropriate, and final photo-ready copy was delivered. A list of the 78 projects for which summaries were prepared is given in Appendix A.

Analyze and Reduce Data

A data analysis plan was prepared, oriented about the fact that most of the information available was qualitative and in open-ended form. Using the same list of variables in eight areas that guided the site visit instrument

development, specific issues of concern for this report were noted. Subsequently, the sources in which information could be found dealing with the issues of concern were identified, along with the specific section(s) or question(s) providing the information. Sources included applications, final reports, the project summaries, and the interviews. Information for each issue was then summarized according to identified themes, categories, or content units. Where themes or content categories could not be identified ahead of time, a content analysis was made of the information dealing with each issue of concern to establish categories. Tally sheets were filled out as needed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study are presented and discussed, as appropriate, in the following seven sections: background and general information, project administration and management, purposes and activities of the projects, project outcomes, evidence of effectiveness, dissemination and adoption, and significance for vocational education.

Background and General Information

As mentioned before, this study included 40 Part C and 38 Part D projects. According to responses received from the Information Request, the idea for 40% of the Part C projects originated in the Department of Education or in the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges. For 32% of the projects, the idea originated with community college, school district, or county office of education staff. The ideas for an additional 12% of the projects originated jointly between Department of Education and other agency staff. For Part D, it was reported that 18% of the projects originated at the Department of Education. The idea for half of the projects originated with county office of education, community college, or school district staff, primarily the latter (29%). The idea for 21% of the Part D projects originated jointly between two agencies.

About 42% of the Part C projects included in this study were directly related to, or were a follow-up of, some previous project or projects. About 80% of the previous projects had been carried out at the same site, and 65% of them had been supported by VEA funds. Considering Part D projects, 58% were directly related to, or were a follow-up of, some previous project or projects. About 73% of the previous projects had been carried out at the same site, and 86% had been supported by VEA funds. In light of the purposes for which Part C and Part D funds are intended, it is interesting that these results are as similar as they are for the two types of projects.

The total proposed expenditures for the Part C and Part D projects, obtained from the applications for funds, are shown in Table B-1 in Appendix B. Included in the total proposed expenditures are both proposed local funds and requested federal funds. The total proposed expenditures for Part C and Part D projects were similar. About 30% of each were in the $30,001 to $45,000 range.

Table 1 shows the amount of Part C and Part D funds actually committed

by year. Of the total of $1,456,474 Part C funds, 36% was committed in 1972-73, 37% in 1973-74, and 27% in 1974-75. For Part D. 18% of the total of $1,261,282 was committed in 1972-73, 31% in 1973-74, and 18% in 1974-75.

Table 1

Funds Committed by Year

Year	Part C		Part D	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
July, 1972, Through June, 1973	$ 522,265	36	$ 227,305	18
July, 1973, Through June, 1974	545,257	37	390,884	31
July, 1974, Through June, 1975	388,952	27	228,383	18
July 1, Through 10, 1975	0	0	414,710[a]	33
Sum	$1,456,474	100	$1,261,282	100

[a]Includes $134,868 for two projects funded from Commissioner's Part D funds.

However, 33% of the total, or $414,710, was committed between July 1 and 10, 1975, a period initially outside the scope of this study. The $414,710 included $134,868 for two projects funded from Commissioner's Part D funds, rather than from section 142(d). It should be noted that EERI staff did not conduct a financial audit. Financial information in this report is presented only to describe some of the characteristics of Part C and Part D projects.

The number of Part C awards made and funds committed by type of recipient are shown in Table 2, while Table 3 shows similar information for Part D. For 45% of the Part C projects, awards were made to community college districts, and they received 40% of the funds. Thirty-two percent of the Part C awards were made to school districts and county offices of education, and accounted for 44% of the funds. Sixty-one percent of the Part D awards were made to school districts and county offices of education, and they were given 55% of the funds. Thirty-four percent of the Part D awards were made to community colleges, accounting for 38% of the funds committed. These results are for projects funded over four different fiscal years. Hence the percentages reported here should not be expected to agree with the percentages used since 1973-74 to allocate Part C and Part D funds by formula to the Department of Education and to the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges.

Table 2

Number of Part C Awards Made and Funds Committed
by Type of Recipient

Type of Recipient	Awards Made		Funds Committed	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
University or State College	6	15	$ 111,832	8
Community College District	18	45	585,184	40
School District and County Office of Education	13	32	639,846	44
Other State Agency	3	8	119,612	8
Sum	40	100	$1,456,474	100

Table 3

Number of Part D Awards Made and Funds Committed
by Type of Recipient

Type of Recipient	Awards Made		Funds Committed	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
University or State College	1	3	$ 25,164	2
Community College District	13	34	483,123	38
School District and County Office of Education	23	61	692,995[a]	55
Other State Agency	1	3	60,000	5
Sum	38	101	$1,261,282	100

[a]Includes $134,868 for two projects funded from Commissioner's Part D funds.

As may be seen in Table B-2 in Appendix B, 28% of the Part C projects were awarded funds in the $20,001 to $30,000 range, while 33% were in a smaller range. The average Part C award was $36,412, with the smallest being $3,433 and the largest $113,018. For Part D, as shown in Table B-3, 26% of the projects were in the $30,001 to $40,000 range, while 45% were in a smaller

range. The largest Part D award was $67,434, and the smallest was $4,834. The mean Part D award was $33,191.

Over the period considered by this study, four Part C or Part D awards were made to one school district. Three awards were made to another district and to each of two county offices of education. Two community college districts each received five awards, and two other community college districts each received three awards.

A comparison was made of the amount of federal money requested on the applications for funds and the amount committed by the state. These amounts were identical for 92% of the Part C projects. That is, the amount requested was the amount awarded. One project received $14,000 less than requested, one received about $850 more, while one received about $15,000 more. Eighty-four percent of the Part D projects received the amount requested, four projects or 11% received $1,000 to $6,000 less, and one received about $12,000 less than requested. However, one project was awarded about $3,500 more than asked for. There was apparently a somewhat greater tendency to award Part D rather than Part C projects less than requested, but most projects were given the amount on the application for funds.

The number of awards made and funds committed by project area are shown in Tables B-4 and B-5. Forty percent of the Part C awards were in the area of the administration or evaluation of vocational education programs, and they accounted for 49% of the Part C funds. Fifteen percent of the funds were committed for projects related to labor market supply and demand information, even though only four awards were made in this area. Considering Part D projects, 14 awards (37%) were in the area of career education and guidance. Another 14 were in the area of instructional techniques or curriculum development. However, 48% of the funds committed were for career education and guidance projects, with only 33% of the money going to instructional techniques or curriculum development. Comparing Tables B-4 and B-5, it may be seen that some types of programs were funded primarily by Part C while others were funded primarily by Part D. However, with one exception, funds from both parts were used to support projects in each program area.

The project areas mentioned above and used for Tables B-4 and B-5 were intended to cover vocational education research and development in general. They should not be confused with priority concerns for California vocational education research activities, which are used to guide funding decisions.

Until 1974-75 the State Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges used the same priorities. Starting in 1974-75 three sets of priorities were used: one for the secondary schools; one for the community colleges; and a set of joint priorities for both agencies. It was difficult to relate the 1974-75 priorities to those used in 1972-73 and 1973-74. The Chancellor's Office applied the priorities to both Part C and Part D projects, while the Department of Education apparently used them just for Part C projects. For these reasons general project areas were used in Tables B-4 and B-5 rather than priority concerns.

Staff at the Part C projects that were site visited were asked why they asked for Part C funds instead of Part D. About 73% said that it was since the project met the guidelines, was research in nature, and not demonstration. Half of the staff at the Part D projects that were site visited said they asked for Part D funds since the project was exemplary. Another 25% said the reason was that the Department of Education recommended that they apply for Part D funds.

As of approximately September, 1976, 38 of the 40 Part C projects had been completed, and one other had been terminated. Twenty-four of the 38 Part D projects had been completed. Nine projects had not been completed, but eight projects had been approved in the first part of July, 1975. Five additional projects may have been completed, but it was hard to tell since final reports for them had not been submitted.

Project Administration and Management

When the dates on funding letters were compared with start dates on applications for funds, it was found that 55% of the Part C and 50% of the Part D projects were notified of funding in sufficient time so that the project could start on the date proposed. There was a delay of up to one month for 71% of the Part C and 31% of the Part D projects not notified in sufficient time, and a delay of up to one year for 24% of the Part C and 38% of the Part D projects.

Site visit respondents were asked if their project had any direct relationship with any other project or activities conducted by their organization at the same time. Sixty-seven percent of the Part C respondents said "No," while 88% of the Part D respondents said "Yes." These results seem to be consistent with what one would expect in terms of the use of Part C and Part D funds.

Through a comparison of the applications for funds with other documents, it was possible to determine whether projects appeared to progress according to schedule in terms of major milestones. Forty-two percent of the Part C projects and 47% of the Part D projects did appear to progress according to schedule. However, information was not available for 21% of the Part D projects. For those projects that did not progress according to schedule, the reasons seemed to be late funding or funding processing problems for 41% of the Part C and 50% of the Part D projects. In addition, staff at 27% of the Part C projects not progressing according to schedule had problems obtaining data, materials, or subjects or problems processing data.

The major problems reported for the Part C and Part D projects are shown in Table B-6. Staff at 38% of the Part C projects, but none of the Part D projects, reported a major difficulty in obtaining a study sample (e.g., a group of students), or in getting data. None of the Part C, but 24% of the Part D project staff, reported that a major problem was administrative red tape or lack of administrative support. Incompetent or inadequate staff was reported as the major problem for 18% of the Part C and 5% of the Part D projects. This result is of particular interest since sections 5.22-2(f) and 6.12(f) of the California State Plan for Vocational Education note that the availability of qualified or competent personnel is one of the factors to be considered when applications for funds are evaluated. No major problems were reported for 20% of the Part C and 29% of the Part D projects.

The adequacy of facilities is also a factor to be considered in the evaluation of applications for funds, according to sections 5.22-2(f) and 6.12(g) of the California State Plan for Vocational Education. Nevertheless, staff at half of the Part D projects that were site visited reported that the facilities were not adequate, and for two other Part D projects one staff member said that the facilities were adequate while another said that they were not.

Some information was collected about requirements that have been in the State Plan for Part D projects but not Part C projects. For example, the extent to which a project promotes cooperation between public education and manpower agencies is another of the factors to be considered in evaluating Part D applications for funds (section 6.12(c)). Two of the eight Part D projects that were site visited used manpower data and did manpower studies, five noted that they used manpower data, and one hired a senior citizen as a

paraprofessional. Also section 6.21-2 of the State Plan calls for the use of a committee to coordinate Part D programs and projects with other programs or projects in the state having the same or similar purposes. However, it was not apparent from discussions with state level staff that such a committee had functioned. When the staff of Part D projects that were visited were asked if steps were taken at the state level to coordinate the project with other programs or projects having the same or similar purposes, 62% said "Yes." The steps were that they were provided information about other projects, or visits were made possible.

The State Plan also notes that Part D applications are to be evaluated on the basis of the involvement and/or participation by nonprofit private schools (section 6.12(d) with additional requirements spelled out in section 6.22). A review of Part D applications uncovered that 63% did not provide any involvement and/or participation by nonprofit private schools. About half of those that did not make such provisions noted that they were not applicable due to the nature of the project or the fact that there were no private schools in the district. But the involvement of nonprofit private schools was not even mentioned in 38% of the applications in which there were no such provisions.

Staff at projects which were site visited were asked whether or not the supervision and monitoring they received from the state was adequate. Just about all who responded felt that it was at least adequate, and some felt that it was very helpful. Staff at 13% of the Part C project sites believed that the monitoring was adequate, but said that they could have used more guidance in some areas. A number of responses were obtained when site visit staff members were asked the nature of the administrative supervision and monitoring from the state. For 33% of the Part C and 38% of Part D projects, it was reported that the state contact person had been actively involved in project planning and/or activities. Another 33% of the Part C project staff reported ongoing communication and visitations with the state contact. Some also noted that they received technical advice or help in preparing the application for funds. However, detailed analyses showed that for 27% of the Part C sites there was only a limited number of visits or contacts with the state monitor, and for half of the Part D sites there was only minimal or informal monitoring or evaluation of the project. There were no consistent differences in these results between projects monitored by the State Department of Education and those monitored by the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges.

State level staff that were interviewed pointed out that staff-initiated projects are usually monitored closely, other projects not so closely. The consensus was that projects are not being monitored as adequately as they were in the past, and that they should be given more adequate and more frequent monitoring.

The actual amount of federal funds claimed, according to the records available, is shown in Table B-2 for Part C and in Table B-3 for Part D. Twenty-eight percent of the Part C projects claimed between $20,001 and $30,000, while 30% claimed less than $20,001. The smallest Part C claim was $1,935, the largest was $75,000, and the mean amount claimed was about $28,750. For Part D projects, 18% claimed between $30,001 and $40,000, 16% claimed $20,001 to $30,000, and 16% claimed less than $20,001. The mean Part D claim was about $31,300, the smallest was $4,834, and the largest was $62,861. These data should be interpreted cautiously. As reported in Tables B-2 and B-3, final claim information was not available for 12% of the Part C projects and 37% of the Part D projects. In addition, information in the Department of Education financial files is sometimes difficult to relate to other information in the files or tell if it is complete.

Based upon available information, a comparison was also made of the differences between the federal funds commited for a project and the amount actually claimed. For 45% of the Part C and 42% of the Part D projects there were no differences. Twenty percent of the Part C projects claimed up to $1,000 less than commited, 18% claimed $1,001 to $6,000 less, while 5% claimed more than $7,000 less. Only 3% of the Part D projects claimed up to $1,000 less than was commited, 13% claimed $1,001 to $6,000 less, and 3%, or one project, claimed about $6,500 less.

The local funds spent as a percent of total program expenditures is shown in Table B-7. Section 131(b) of P.L. 90-576 states that Part C funds can be used "to pay 90 per centum of the costs of programs and projects...." There is no similar restriction on Part D funds. Although the language used does not seem to require that the 90% restriction be applied to every award, instructions sent out by the State of California announcing the availability of Part C funds have stated that: "A minimum of ten percent (10%) of the total cost of the project must be provided by the agency from local sources. When local benefit is higher than regional, state or national benefit, the local support required for funding may be higher than ten percent." As may be seen in

Table B-7, according to the information available, no local funds were provided for 18% of the Part C projects. For 22% of the projects some local funds, but less than 10% of the total project expenditures, were provided, while for 12% of the projects exactly 10% of the expenditures were provided. Over 10% of the total expenditures were provided for 35% of the Part C projects so that the average over all Part C projects exceeded 10%. Nevertheless, it is apparent that requirements specified by the state were not necessarily followed.

A closer inspection was made of the relatively large number of projects (22%) that provided some local funds, but less than 10%. It was found that all had 9% to 9.9% of total expenditures provided from local sources. This occurred since project staff proposed local funds amounting to 10% of the Part C funds requested, rather than 10% of total project expenditures. The confusion may trace back to instructions provided by the state for completing an application for Part C funds. There it said, in contradiction to the instructions quoted above: "Enter local contribution. This contribution may not be less than ten percent of the amount of Part C funds requested."

As noted above, there is no 90% restriction in P.L. 90-576 regarding the use of Part D funds. However, the State Plan does require that applications for Part D funds state the portion of the total cost to be borne by the applicant. Table B-7 shows that, on the basis of the information available, no local funds were provided for 29% of the Part D projects. For 8% of the Part D projects some local funds, but less than 10% of total expenditures, were provided. Twenty-four percent of the projects provided 11% to 70% of the total expenditures. When staff at the eight Part D projects that were site visited were asked if resources other than Part D funds were used to support the project, 88% said "Yes." The other resources were usually district funds, but sometimes federal or state funds.

Site visited project staff were also asked whether, as the project progressed, they found the cost estimates in the application for funds still reasonable. Most of them answered "Yes." Similarly, most said "No" when asked if they thought that the money could have been used better.

One of the questions on the Information Request asked respondents if there were any suggestions for changes or improvements in the Part C and Part D regulations, procedures, or the system of managing the grant funds. A summary of the results is given in Table B-8. There were no suggestions for 38% of

the Part C projects and 24% of the Part D projects. The most frequent single suggestion, made by 18% of both Part C and Part D respondents, was earlier funding. State level staff who were interviewed agreed that at times this may be a problem, but they pointed out that they may not know how much federal money has been allotted until three or four months after a fiscal year has started. Forward funding from the U.S. Office of Education would be needed to solve the problem. It was also noted that it takes a number of months to review applications, decide which projects should be funded and why, and complete the rest of the approval process.

For 21% of the Part D projects, the suggestion was made that there should be a longer funding period. Although P.L. 90-576 states that financial assistance may not be given under Part D to any program or project for a period exceeding three years, in California they have traditionally been one year awards. This issue has apparently been of concern for some time. In a report on a review of the vocational education grants management system made in 1974 (Coopers & Lybrand, 1974), it was suggested that continuity of support be provided, where desirable, by approving multiyear projects subject to the future availability of funds.

Ten percent of the Part C respondents and 5% of the Part D respondents said that funding priorities should be set by local authorities or field personnel. Coopers and Lybrand (1974) had also noted that the determination of educational priorities at other than the local level hinders enthusiastic pursuit of problems relevant to a particular district. But it can also be reasoned, as noted by state staff, that available funds may have more impact if the money is put where administrators think it should go. Other problems related to setting priorities have been discussed recently by the national Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development (1976), and need not be repeated here.

Other suggestions made for changes or improvements included that more publicity was needed on fund availability, eligibility, and priority, and that political considerations should be eliminated in making funding decisions. These comments were probably made since, in recent years for Part C, there has been a shift away from field-initiated applications in response to a notice of the availability of fund to state staff-initiated projects. For Part D, the funds were generally used in a discretionary manner, and all projects were solicited. State level staff presented both pros and cons regarding whether

the procedures for awarding Part C funds should be the same as the procedures for awarding Part D funds. The Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office of the Community Colleges each use somewhat different processes and procedures to decide which projects to fund. Each, however, follows a series of review steps.

Purposes and Activities of the Projects

The projects studied had a variety of purposes, objectives, and activities to accomplish. As a result, it was not possible to easily summarize them for this report. EERI staff did, however, review applications and reports to determine the way in which the funds were primarily used. As shown in Table B-9, for 48% of the Part C projects the funds were used to improve an existing program, for 18% to develop a new program, and for 12% to extend an existing program. For 55% of the Part D projects the funds were used to develop a new program, while 21% used the funds to extend an existing program and 13% used them to improve an existing program. No funds were used to maintain an existing program.

Project staff was asked, on the Information Request, how the design and methods used in conducting the project might have been improved. Although a large number of respondents either did not answer the question or had no suggestions, from the others a wide range of specific suggestions were noted. Common themes included the need for better communication and training of project staff or participants, and that the purposes or design of the project should have been clarified.

According to federal regulations, copies of final reports for both Part C and Part D projects are to be submitted to the U.S. Office of Education. (See, for example, sections 102.73(b) and 102.81(b) under "State Vocational Education Programs" in the July 24, 1974, Federal Register.) On the Information Request it was reported that all but one completed Part C project had submitted a narrative final report. Final reports had not been submitted by five or 17% of the completed Part D projects.

Project Outcomes

Table B-10 shows the accomplishments reported by staff of the Part C and Part D projects in final reports or during the site visits. Not included are products produced by projects, which are discussed below. Forty percent of the Part C projects reported that they provided information helpful in

vocational education program development, 30% reported that they developed information, evaluation, or follow-up systems, while 20% provided training for vocational educators or project staff. The most frequent accomplishment for Part D projects was the development or implementation of vocational education or career education programs, reported by 34%. Twenty-nine percent of the Part D projects evaluated vocational education programs or placement service systems, while 24% provided training for vocational educators or project staff.

Shown in Table B-11 are the types of products produced by the projects, other than final reports. Thirty-five percent of the Part C projects and 24% of the Part D projects did not produce any products. Twenty-two percent of the Part C projects produced guides or handbooks for implementing programs or systems; 12% produced curricula, curriculum guides, or curriculum units; 15% produced audiovisual materials for instruction or dissemination; and 10% produced printouts of information, such as manpower data, skill needs, job descriptions, etc. The most frequent type of product for Part D projects was curricula, curriculum guides, or curriculum units, produced by 37% of the projects. Twenty-one percent of the Part D projects produced audiovisual materials for instruction or dissemination, and 13% produced informational brochures.

On the Information Request was a question asking if there were any differences between what was planned for the project in the application for funds and what was actually done. Seventy percent of the Part C respondents said that there were no differences. Of those who replied "Yes," 82% said that the reason for the difference was that the project was reduced in scope. About half of the Part D respondents said that there were differences between what was planned and what was done. In about half the time the differences occurred since the project was reduced in scope, while in the other half it was because the project expanded its scope.

The Information Request also asked who benefited from the project. For Part C, the percentages of respondents noting various beneficiaries were: administrators, at local and state level, 72%; teachers, 40%; counselors, 20%; students, 12%; and the community, 12%. For Part D respondents, the percentages were: students, 61%; teachers, 45%; administrators, 37%; counselors, 24%; and the community, 16%. In addition, indirect student benefits were noted by 32% of the Part C and 24% of the Part D respondents. EERI staff attempted to determine the number of students served by each project, but was not particularly

successful in doing so. The only tentative conclusion that could be drawn was that in most cases the number of students served was relatively small. However, it should also be mentioned that the research priorities used to guide funding decisions were not always oriented to students directly.

In looking over the available information for reported evidence of direct benefits to students or other beneficiaries, it was found that no evidence was reported for 35% of the Part C and 39% of the Part D projects. For 22% of the Part C and 18% of the Part D projects, it was reported that without the project the service provided by or information found by the project would not be available. It was also reported for 15% of the Part C projects that the project resulted in other studies or improvements in vocational education. Favorable evaluation by workshop participants was cited as evidence of direct benefits to beneficiaries for 13% of the Part D projects. In the opinion of EERI staff, most of the "evidence" of direct benefits noted above, when it was reported, is not particularly convincing in terms of the nature of the evidence. In addition, the evaluations procedures used were not particularly rigorous.

Evidence of Effectiveness

This section addresses evidence of the effectiveness of projects in meeting their objectives, and evidence of the effectiveness of products produced by the projects. The California State Plan for Vocational Education requires that each prospectus for Part C funds include a plan for determining whether or not each objective was attained (section 5.21-1(g)), that each application contain an evaluation component (section 5.21-2(d)), and that each application be reviewed for an evaluation section that is appropriate and adequate for the project (section 5.22-2(e)). All Part D applications are to state the methods of providing objective evaluation (section 6.11). The instructions for applying for Part C funds that were sent out during the time period covered by this study went into greater detail as to what the evaluation component should have been designed to accomplish. In addition to determining whether each objective was attained, the evaluation component should have provided for measuring and reporting the extent of attainment of each objective. The plan for measurement, the instruments and techniques to be used, and the method of treatment of the measurement data were also to have been described. EERI staff reviewed applications and final reports,

and found that for a large majority of Part C and Part D projects evaluation plans had been prepared. At times, however, the evaluation component described how the data that would be collected for the project would be analyzed, rather than including what the instructions called for.

The information available to EERI staff was analyzed to determine how the projects were, or were to be, evaluated to determine the extent to which they were successful in meeting their objectives as given in the applications for funds. Twenty-two percent of the Part C and 3% of the Part D projects were apparently not so evaluated. Twenty-five percent of the Part C projects were evaluated by an advisory committee or by project staff, while 22% were evaluated by an outside or third party evaluator or evaluation committee. Information was obtained from participants for 20% of the projects. In only 5% of the Part C projects were statistical comparisons made using before- and after-treatment testing or experimental and control groups, but they are not always appropriate. Of course, which evaluation procedures would be used would depend upon the specific project objectives being considered. The most frequent ways that Part D projects were evaluated to determine the extent to which they were successful in meeting their objectives were: staff documented that project activities were completed, 21%; used before- and after-treatment testing or experimental and control groups, 21%; and obtained information from participants, 18%.

Since any given project would be expected to have a number of specific objectives, it was not possible to determine the extent to which each project met each of its objectives. Instead, the available information was reviewed to see what evidence was reported that projects accomplished their stated purposes. As shown in Table B-12, a number of types of evidence were reported, which was not surprising considering the fact that a variety of purposes were represented by the projects. For Part C projects, the most frequently reported evidence that a project accomplished its stated purpose was that an internal evaluation committee or project staff said that it did. It was mentioned for 45% of the Part C projects. The fact that promised data, products, or other project outcomes are available was noted as evidence for 38% of the Part C projects, 20% reported that the project resulted in other projects or program recommendations, and 18% said that products developed by the project were adopted elsewhere. Information was not available or was not reported by 20% of the Part C projects. Information was also not available for 34% of the

Part D projects. The most frequently reported evidence that a Part D project accomplished its stated purpose was, as with the Part C projects, that project staff or an internal advisory committee said that it did (42%). Four other types of evidence were each reported by 16% of the Part D projects. They were: promised data, products, or other project outcomes are available; the project or program continued at the site on a permanent or expanded basis; participants responded favorably to the project; and favorable results were obtained on statistical comparisons. What is apparent from these results is that much of the evidence that a project accomplished its stated purpose is not particularly objective when it is reported.

EERI staff also considered what projects reported about how products produced by a project were evaluated to determine their effectiveness. This was an issue of concern since, for example, a project may have met an objective by developing curriculum materials, but this is no proof that the materials are effective in teaching students. As used here, a product is any tangible outcome from a project which can be used in educational settings to improve or facilitate the education process. Examples include curriculum materials, administrative or teacher training materials, replicable models, tests, catalogs, handbooks, guidelines, computer programs, etc. Approximately 65% of the Part C and 75% of the Part D projects produced products other than final reports. For about 20% of the Part C and 10% of the Part D projects there was no evidence that products had been evaluated, while information was not available about how products were evaluated for 12% of the Part C and 37% of the Part D projects. The most frequently reported evidence that products produced were successful was that the product was requested or adopted elsewhere, noted for 18% of both Part C and Part D projects. Other evidence of effectiveness (15% of Part C and 11% of Part D projects) was that the product continued to be used at the site. For 13% of the Part D, but none of the Part C projects, the reported evidence of the effectiveness of products was favorable results obtained on statistical comparisons, such as before- and after-use comparisons. However, as previously noted, such comparisons are not always appropriate.

On the Information Request, project staff were asked if, since completion of the project, any evidence had been obtained showing the effectiveness of the project or its products. About half of the Part C and Part D respondents replied "Yes." The evidence cited, however, was too varied and idiosyncratic to summarize meaningfully.

Dissemination and Adoption

Seventy-two percent of the Part C and 74% of the Part D project respondents indicated on the Information Request that activities were undertaken to disseminate products or results of projects to potential users. The most frequent activity, for 41% of the Part C and 61% of the Part D projects that had dissemination activities, was that copies of materials were made and distributed. The second most frequent activity was giving audiovisual or oral presentations (34% and 39%), while the third was the use of inservice training workshops (31% and 36%). Generally, there appeared to be little difference between Part C and Part D projects as far as dissemination activities were concerned.

During the 1972-75 period, section 6.21-3 of the California State Plan for Vocational Education stated that conferences would be conducted by state staff so that persons who actually conducted exemplary programs would have the opportunity to explain the operations and outcomes of their programs. Staff at the Part D projects that were site visited were asked if any staff members attended such conferences. Sixty-two percent of the replies were "No."

As one item related to adoption, project staff members were asked on the Information Request whether the program continued at the original location after completion of the project. Fifty-eight percent of the Part C respondents said "Yes." Of these, 22% of the programs continued for one year, 13% continued two or three years, and 61% continued indefinitely. It was also reported that 30% of the programs that were continued were supported by additional Part C funds, while 70% continued without support from either Part C or Part D. The results for Part D projects were similar. Sixty-one percent of the programs continued after completion of the project. Of these, 30% continued for one year, 22% continued for two or three years, and 48% continued indefinitely. Thirty-nine percent of the programs that were continued were supported by additional Part D funds, while 57% continued without additional support from either Part C or Part D. In terms of their intended purposes, one might have expected a better showing from the Part D projects for these results, as compared with the Part C projects.

Project staff was also asked on the Information Request if products produced by the project had been used or adopted at the original location or anywhere else. Fifty-five percent of the Part C respondents said "Yes," with 77% of these reporting one product while the rest reported multiple products. Most of the products had been used for a year or less. Somewhat fewer Part D

than Part C project respondents, or 45%, indicated that products had been adopted. About one-half of those respondents noted that the project had produced only one product. As for Part C projects, most of the products had been used for only a year or less. Information about the extent of use of each product was also asked, but it was often not reported and was difficult to summarize. Generally, it can probably be assumed that the number of products reported was an underestimate since the respondents were not given a formal definition of "product" and some were probably overlooked. It was also apparent that in a number of cases the respondents did not know the length, and especially the extent of use, of their products.

In answer to the question "Did the project result in any lasting effects to the recipient organization?" 72% of the Part C respondents said "Yes." Of these, 34% said that the program continued or expanded, 34% noted better staff knowledge or communication, and 21% said that instruction or the curriculum had improved. Somewhat fewer Part D respondents, 63%, replied "Yes" to the question. Of these about 50% reported that the program continued or expanded, 21% noted improved instruction or curriculum, and 17% said that student needs are better met. For both Part C and Part D projects, other lasting effects were also mentioned.

Three questions related to dissemination and adoption were asked of staff only at the projects that were site visited. The first was whether the products produced by the project resulted in changes of operational procedures somewhere. Staff at about 70% of both the Part C and Part D projects said "Yes," but the reported changes that were made were varied and difficult to summarize. The second question asked was whether, since the end of the project, project results other than products had been used at the original location or anywhere else. Sixty-seven percent of Part C staff said "Yes," and as might be expected a number of types of results were noted. However, for 60% of those that said "Yes" the project result was used only at the original location. A larger percentage of Part D staff, 88%, answered "Yes" to the question. Project results were used at the original location for 86% of these.

The third question posed to staff at site visit projects was whether further dissemination of project outcomes would be desirable. Seventy-three percent of Part C and 62% of Part D project staff replied "Yes." This question was also asked of state staff. While all agreed that further dissemination of project outcomes was either necessary or desirable, it was

also pointed out that some selectivity would be necessary to decide what warrants dissemination. These are, apparently, old problems. Coopers and Lybrand (1974) had noted that information as to the results of completed projects is generally not available to districts desiring to benefit from reviewing programs in other parts of the state. In addition, they said that a formal information system should be designed to disseminate the results of completed projects. Recommendations regarding dissemination and utilization were also made by the recent national Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development (1976).

Forty-eight percent of the Part C Information Request respondents said that other projects were initiated that resulted from the project. Most of these, 63%, resulted in one project, and it was usually at the same location as the original project. Interestingly, only 34% of Part D respondents said that other projects were initiated that resulted from the project. Of these, 62% resulted in only one other project, but 15% resulted in five or more other projects. As was found for Part C. the resulting projects were most often at the same location as the original project.

Significance for Vocational Education

The significance of the projects studied for vocational education is, of course, judgmental. Staff at the site visit projects were, for example, asked if the needs met by the products of the project were major needs of vocational educators in general. For 67% of the Part C and 88% of the Part D projects, the answer was "Yes." Part D project staff were also asked if the program did, or will, have impact in reducing youth unemployment, which was one of the needs mentioned in P.L. 90-576. Seventy-five percent of the respondents said "Yes." An additional question, related to another emphasis to be given the use of Part D funds, was whether the program did, or will, have impact on meeting the vocational education needs of disadvantaged and handicapped youth. All respondents said "Yes," but one noted that it had not been intentional.

One item on the Information Request asked what the respondent believed the significance of project outcomes was for vocational education. Such a variety of responses was received that it was not possible to summarize the comments in a meaningful way. However, some of the kinds of things referred to by Part C respondents included improved counseling methods, follow-up systems, needs analyses, and manpower or labor projections. Part D respondents

noted career education, manpower information or projections, and skill development and training.

The significance of project outcomes for vocational education locally, regionally, statewide, or nationally, in the opinion of EERI staff members, was noted in the separate project summaries that were prepared. These judgments are summarized in Table 4. Thirty percent of the Part C projects were judged to have had only local significance, while 28% had significance at the state level.

Table 4

Significance of Part C and Part D Project Outcomes for Vocational Education

Significance	Part C		Part D	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No Significance	4	10	2	5
Local	12	30	11	29
Regional	4	10	0	0
Statewide	11	28	4	11
National	4	10	5	13
Not Enough Information Available	5	12	16	42
Sum	40	100	38	100

Note. "Not Enough Information Available" includes developmental projects and projects not completed. The judgments of significance were made by Educational Evaluation and Research, Inc., staff after all available information was reviewed and project summaries were prepared.

Twenty-nine percent of the Part D projects were judged to have had only local significance, and 11% had significance at the state level. However, a judgment could not be made for 42% of the Part D projects since not enough information was available to do so. Sometimes the information was not available since the projects are not as yet completed. Although 10% of the Part C and 5% of the Part D projects did not seem to have any immediate significance, 10% of the Part C projects and 13% of the Part D projects were judged to have significance at the national level.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The following conclusions seem warranted:

1. It appears that most projects received the amount of money requested on the application for funds.

2. There have been delays in funding, and at times projects have inadequate lead time to get organized and hire personnel. Although some of the delay can be attributed to late notification to the state by the U.S. Office of Education of the allocation of funds for a fiscal year, with the carryover funds available in recent years not all delays in funding projects would seem to have been unavoidable.

3. There is some confusion among some state staff regarding how Part C and Part D funds are accounted for. They do not know how the funds are accounted for, and feel that they can not find out.

4. There are differences of opinion among state staff regarding how priorities for the use of Part C and Part D funds should be determined. There is also some question as to how useful past priorities have been.

5. The California State Plan for Vocational Education has not been followed as well as it might have been in the review of Part C prospectuses and Part C and Part D applications, nor have requirements given in instructions for applying for Part C funds necessarily been enforced. For example, there is some indication that projects have been awarded funds without adequate attention to the competency and qualifications of personnel. Stated project objectives are often not clear or sufficiently specific, and sometimes do not match or adequately cover the stated purpose of the project. This allows changes in the focus of a project after it has been in operation for a time. The evaluation design section of applications is often used to explain how data will be analyzed, not how project activities will be evaluated, and the methods of providing evaluation are often not particularly objective. For Part C, the stated local funds requirements have not been followed on a regular basis. And for Part D, applications often do not specifically address factors to be evaluated in the review of applications, such as the extent to which the project will promote cooperation between public education and manpower agencies.

6. With some exception for state staff-initiated projects, neither Part C nor Part D projects have been monitored as adequately as they might be. In

addition, project staff could probably profit from some kind of consultation with state personnel as they sit down to plan, step by step, what they will do.

7. The documentation in state files could be improved. It would also be easier to review the past progress and accomplishments of projects if all information for a given project, including the application, financial forms, progress reports, and the final report, were kept together.

8. In most cases the number of students served by a project seemed to be relatively small, if it served students. Administrators benefited most from Part C projects, students from Part D projects. Regardless of the beneficiary, evidence of direct benefits was not particularly convincing.

9. The evaluation procedures used by projects to determine the extent to which they met their objectives were often not very rigorous and the results were not particularly objective when they were reported. Relatively few projects used an outside evaluator. Many projects were evaluated by an advisory committee that attested that objectives had been met.

10. Generally, it appears that most projects accomplished the major purposes set forth in their applications, though at times not as explicitly as they might have. Hence, it can be concluded that most of the projects were successful.

11. It is difficult to obtain information about the impact of a given project after its completion since there is no particular motivation, nor are resources available, for project staff to maintain the necessary records.

12. There appeared to be little difference between Part C and Part D projects as far as dissemination activities were concerned. Also, the fact that more projects resulted from Part C than Part D projects leads one to question the extent to which Part D projects were "exemplary and innovative."

13. The further dissemination of selected project outcomes and information about both Part C and Part D projects would appear to be highly desirable.

14. For any large number of projects, especially where research and development is involved, it cannot be expected that the outcomes for all projects will have widespread significance for vocational education. It is encouraging that a number of projects included in this study seemed to have significance at the state or national level.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered:

1. The procedures given in the California State Plan for Vocational Education should be followed and the requirements in it should be adhered to or they should be changed. The procedures and requirements should be looked at and reworked, if necessary, every two or three years.

2. Improved and more thorough instructions for applying for Part C funds and instructions for preparing an application should be developed. For Part D, a standardized application format asking for specific information should be used. Included in these documents should be recommended minimal evaluation requirements. They should also spell out in greater detail what is meant by those factors specified in the California State Plan for Vocational Education that are to be evaluated in the review of prospectuses and applications. For example, for Part D, what is meant by "cooperation with manpower agencies?" More thorough instructions initially should result in fewer problems later on.

3. Procedures should be developed, as necessary, to assure that the reviewers of prospectuses and applications for funds pay adequate attention to all of the evaluation criteria given in the State Plan. Greater attention to the evaluation factors specified in the State Plan should help increase the probability that a project will meet its objectives if it is funded.

4. Since there are relatively few state staff to monitor Part C and Part D projects, it is recommended that over a period of time a series of written guidelines be prepared that can be issued to project staff on an as-needed basis. These guidelines could serve a training as well as a management function. Included might be: suggested contents of quarterly reports; how to document changes of objectives; suggested evaluation procedures; the kinds of records that should be kept to allow post hoc measurement and evaluation of project outcomes; suggested dissemination procedures; and guidelines for the organization and content of final reports.

5. State staff should consider how, within budget constraints, it might be possible to improve the monitoring of projects. It might be expected that monitoring will become even more important if VEA projects are to be funded by contracts rather than grants. A quarterly monitoring visit could be taken as a standard. However, more frequent and intensive monitoring at the early part of a project should help head off major changes or muddling later. As

necessary, project monitors should provide, or provide for, technical consulting in research techniques and project management.

6. High priority should be given by state staff to helping applicants and projects improve the evaluation procedures used to determine the extent to which objectives are met. These procedures should be as objective and data-based as possible. Outside evaluators or evaluation consultants should be required when it appears necessary to complement the evaluation skills of project staff. The desirability of funding fewer projects so that those funded can have an adequate evaluation component should also be considered.

7. Consideration should be given to having a coordinated or centralized vocational education master file containing both fiscal material and other project documents and reports. More thorough records should also be kept to assure that all required materials are sent to the U.S. Office of Education in a timely manner.

8. Serious consideration should be given to whether the policies and procedures for awarding and managing Part C and Part D funds should be the same for the State Department of Education and for the California Community Colleges. If differences are found to be necessary or desirable, then the appropriate approval should be obtained and the State Plan modified accordingly.

9. State staff should attempt to resolve the question as to whether the Department of Education and Community Colleges should have separate priorities for the use of Part C and Part D funds. The Department of Education should reconsider the procedures used to determine priorities, and should try to develop a systematic way of identifying priorities. As required by the State Plan, all priorities should be generated from local, area, and statewide needs. But there should also be provisions for accepting applications outside the priority areas if special needs arise.

10. Part C and Part D projects should be accepted both on a solicited and an unsolicited basis, and not on the basis of one to the exclusion of the other.

11. For projects where it is appropriate, provision should be made for multiyear funding subject to the later availability of funds and an adequate yearly evaluation of progress. In addition, if any project is not to be awarded the funds initially requested, the applicant should have an opportunity to cut back on the objectives or reduce the scope of work.

12. Every attempt should be made to try to assure that the relatively

limited Part C and Part D funds are not used for continuing endeavors that have become primarily operational. That is, after a project or program becomes operational the routine operational functions should no longer be supported by research and development funds.

13. A formal system should be developed to disseminate the results and products of completed projects. A systematic way should be found for collecting, storing, duplicating, and packaging materials in a useful form. A central index of materials and reports would also be useful.

REFERENCES

Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development. Assessing vocational education research and development. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976.

Coopers and Lybrand. Review of the vocational education grants management system. Sacramento, Calif.: Author, December 1974. (VEA Project No. 19-30049-C-4-036)

APPENDIX A

PROJECTS INCLUDED IN STUDY AND FOR WHICH SUMMARIES WERE PREPARED

Antioch Unified School District
Multidisciplinary Model, Distributive Education
Project No. 07-61648-D-4, Part D Grant

Antioch Unified School District
Multidisciplinary Model, Distributive Education, Phase II
Project No. 07-61648-D-6-010, Part D Grant

Board of Trustees, Leland Stanford Jr. University
Student Perceptions of the Link Between School and Work
Project No. 43-20438-C-4-030, Part C Grant

California Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training
An Examination of the Effectiveness of Target Area Vocational Education Programs for Disadvantaged Persons in the Los Angeles Area
Project No. 34-74229-C-3-001, Part C Grant

California Polytechnic State University Foundation
Involvement of Vocational Agriculture Students in Vocational Education Student Organizations
Project No. 40-30569-C-5-037, Part C Grant

California State Department of Corrections
Reasons for Dropout and Inhibitors to Training-Related Job Placement of Vocational Education Trainees
Project No. 34-32102-C-4-034, Part C Grant

California State University, Fresno
Interpretive Study: Mainstreaming Vocational Education for the Handicapped in California Secondary Schools
Project No. 10-30593-D-6-010, Part D Grant

California State University, San Francisco
Action Research Training for Vocational Educators
Project No. 38-30643-C016-73, Part C Grant

California Youth Authority
Karl Holton Individualized Manpower Training System Project
Project No. 34-34348-D-5, Part D Grant

Ceres Unified School District
Career Education Responsive to Every Student (Second Year)
Project No. 50-71043-D-3, Part D Grant

Ceres Unified School District
Career Education Responsive to Every Student (Third Year)
Project No. 50-71043-D-5, Part D Grant

Cerritos Community College District
Profiles of Community College Students in Career Occupational Counseling
Project No. 19-64360-C-4-233, Part C Grant

Clovis Unified School District
Comprehensive Office Training Program
Project No. 10-62117-D-4, Part D Grant

Clovis Unified School District
Comprehensive Office Training Program
Project No. 10-62117-D-6-010, Part D Grant

Coast Community College District
Chartering
Project No. 30-66639-C3-300, Part C Grant

Columbia College Consortia (Yosemite Jr. College District)
Developing a Comprehensive and Articulated Concept for College Career Centers: Small College Component
Project No. 50-71340-D-6-010, Part D Grant

Foothill Community College District
Establishing Occupational Education Research Priorities in California Community Colleges
Project No. 43-69443-C079-73, Part C Grant

Foothill Community College District
Synthesis of Handicapped and Disadvantaged Vocational Educational Model into COPES Design
Project No. 43-69443-C089-73, Part C Grant

Foothill Community College District
Project COPES - Part C
Project No. 43-69443-C-4-234, Part C Grant

Foothill Community College District
COPES: Subsystem for Work Experience Programs
Project No. 43-69443-C-5-801, Part C Grant

Foothill-DeAnza Community College District
Career Information Systems Project
Project No. 43-69443-D-6-010, Part D Grant

Fremont Unified School District
Operational Model for Career Development and Vocational Preparation
Project No. 01-61176-D1-6, Commissioner's Part D Grant

Grossmont Union High School District
A Study of Career Centers in the State of California
Project No. 37-68130-C-4-035, Part C Grant

Huntington Beach Union High School District
Operational Model for Career Development and Vocational Preparation
Project No. 30-66548-D1-6, Commissioner's Part D Grant

Los Angeles Community College District
Development of an Audiovisual Self-Identification Model for Use in Vocational Counseling
Project No. 19-64741-C059-73, Part C Grant

Los Angeles Community College District
Comprehensive Community College Foreign Car Manufacturer Cooperative Education Program to Develop Entry-Level Automotive Technicians
Project No. 19-64741-D-3, Part D Grant

Los Angeles Community College District
Assessing the Needs of Aging and Retired Persons for Career Services in the Greater Los Angeles Area
Project No. 19-64741-C4-202, Part C Grant

Los Angeles Community College District
Improving Occupational Student Follow-Up in California Community Colleges
Project No. 19-64741-C-4-235, Part C Grant

Los Angeles Community College District
Launching a Consortium to Plan a "Metropolitan Supermarket" Approach to Improvement of Career Guidance Centers as Part of a Statewide Model
Project No. 19-64741-D-6-010, Part D Grant

Los Rios Community College District
A Model Career Placement Service
Project No. 34-67371-D-4, Part D Grant

Los Rios Community College District
A Model Career Plaement Service, Phase II
Project No. 34-67371-D-5, Part D Grant

Los Rios Community College District
A Model Career Placement Service, Phase III
Project No. 34-67371-D-6-020, Part D Grant

Lynwood Unified School District
A Study to Assess the Lynwood Unified School District's Vocational Education Program
Project No. 19-64774-D-4, Part D Grant

Mendocino County Office of Education
Northern California Mobile Agriculture Career Education Project
Project No. 23-10231-D-3, Part D Grant

Mendocino County Office of Education
Vocational Education Data Management System for Rural Schools
Project No. 23-10231-C-5-041, Part C Grant

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District
Research on Intrinsic-Extrinsic Motivation Concepts as Applied to Selected Vocational Instructional Programs
Project No. 33-67132-C084-73, Part C Grant

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District
Research on Application of a Self-Actualization Process in an Attempt to Improve Effort and Performance in Selected Vocational Programs
Project No. 33-67132-C-4-214, Part C Grant

Office of the Napa County Superintendent of Schools
District Review of Vocational Education Staff
Project No. 28-10280-C-5-020, Part C Grant

Orange Unified School District
Career Education Model Orange County Consortium (Second Year)
Project No. 30-66621-D-3, Part D Grant

Orange Unified School District
Career Education Model Orange County Consortium (Third Year)
Project No. 30-66621-D-5, Part D Grant

Pasadena Area Community College District
Office of the Director of Occupational Education Programs for High Schools
Project No. 19-64899-D-3, Part D Grant

Pasadena Area Community College District
System of Interactive Guidance and Information (SIGI)
Project No. 19-64899-C-4-237, Part C Grant

Rancho Los Amigos Hospital
The Effects of Providing Pre-educational Treatment to Handicapped Young Adults to Increase Their Readiness for College and Vocational Education Programs: A Controlled Experimental Study
Project No. 19-20198-C-4-016, Part C Grant

Sacramento County Office of Education
Field Testing of a Computer-Based Manpower Projection System
Project No. 34-10348-C096-73, Part C Grant

Sacramento County Office of Education
Industry Validated Vocational Performance Objectives
Project No. 34-10348-C-4-004, Part C Grant

San Diego Community Colleges
Field Test of a Vocational Research Training Model that Integrates Management and Evaluation Concepts
Project No. 37-73528-C071-73, Part C Grant

San Diego Community Colleges
Priority Determination for Vocational Education through a Formal Needs Assessment Process
Project No. 37-73528-C073-73, Part C Grant

San Diego County Office of Education
Dial-A-Career
Project No. 37-10371-D-3, Part D Grant

San Diego County Office of Education
Third Party Evaluation of California Career Education Projects
Project No. 37-10371-C-4-400, Part C Grant

San Diego Unified School District
Public Service Occupations for Disadvantaged Students
Project No. 37-68338-D-4-010, Part D Grant

San Diego Unified School District
Comprehensive Senior High School Career Education Model
Project No. 37-68338-D-4-020, Part D Grant

San Diego Unified School District
Research Into Identification of Cultural Disadvantagement as a Key Segment of a Vocational Student Information System
Project No. 37-68338-C-5-040, Part C Grant

San Diego Unified School District
Competency Based Curriculum - Business Marketing Careers
Project No. 37-68338-C-5-042, Part C Grant

San Jose Community College District
The Use of Need Assessment in Improving the Utility of Community College Advisory Committees
Project No. 43-69658-C-4-208, Part C Grant

San Juan Unified School District
Modern Keyboard Office Equipment, Mobile Units
Project No. 34-67447-D-3, Part D Grant

San Juan Unified School District
Business Enterprise Training Program
Project No. 34-67447-D-5, Part D Grant

San Juan Unified School District
Mesa Verde Business Enterprise Training Program
Project No. 34-67447-D-6-010, Part D Grant

San Mateo Community College District
Development of a Supermarket Management Program with Emphasis on Coordinated Instruction Education Systems Approach (Phase I)
Project No. 41-69054-D-3, Part D Grant

San Mateo Community College District
Development of a Supermarket Management Program with Emphasis on Coordinated Instruction Education Systems Approach (Phase II)
Project No. 41-69054-D-4, Part D Grant

San Mateo Community College District
Development of a Supermarket Management Program with Emphasis on Coordinated Instruction Education Systems Approach (Phase III)
Project No. 41-69054-D-5, Part D Grant

San Mateo County Office of Education
Evaluation of Career Education Activities at 10 Project Sites in California
Project No. 41-10413-C103-73, Part C Grant

Santa Ana Unified School District
Career Education Management System (Phase III)
Project No. 30-66670-D-3, Part D Grant

Santa Barbara County Schools
Field Test of Project No. 42-10421-C048-71: The Research and Evaluation of Follow-up Studies of High School Graduates Using Sampling Methods
Project No. 42-10421-C049-73, Part C Grant

Santa Barbara County Schools
Development, Field Test, and Evaluation of a Method for Statewide Longitudinal Follow-Ups of High School Graduates Using Sampling Techniques
Project No. 42-10421-C-4-011, Part C Grant

Santa Barbara County Schools
Following Up on High School Graduates
Project No. 42-10421-D-5, Part D Grant

Santa Clara Unified School District
Office Education Instructional Program Model to Provide All Students with Entry-Level Job Competencies
Project No. 43-69674-D-4, Part D Grant

Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District
Selection and Testing of a Systems Planning Model by Community College Vocational Educators and Research Personnel
Project No. 45-70144-C053-73, Part C Grant

Simi Valley Unified School District
Preliminary Project for Establishing Technically Related Instructional Programs with Industry Needs
Project No. 56-72603-D-5, Part D Grant

South County Joint Community College District
Labor Market Analysis Survey for Handicapped Students
Project No. 01-61317-C065-73, Part C Grant

Sweetwater Community College District
Needs Assessment, Planning and Evaluation Internship Training and Services for Community Colleges Occupational Education
Project No. 37-68429-D-4, Part D Grant

University of California, Davis, University Extension
Preparing Single Farm Workers for Alternative Employment Programs
Project No. 57-30023-C019-73, Part C Grant

University of California, Los Angeles
A Study of the Vocational Education Grants Management System
Project No. 19-30049-C-4-036, Part C Grant

University of Califonia, Los Angeles
Career Education Opinions of California Educators
Project No. 19-30049-C-5-038, Part C Grant

Ventura County Superintendent of Schools
Manpower Projection Model System: Phase II
Project No. 56-10561-C037-73, Part C Grant

Ventura County Superintendent of Schools
Manpower Management Information Dissemination Project
Project No. 56-10561-D-4, Part D Grant

Ventura County Superintendent of Schools
Manpower Management Information System: Educational Resources
Project No. 50-10561-C-5-039, Part C Grant

Yosemite Community College District
Comparison of Listening-Viewing Comprehension Levels of Vocational Education Students Compared to the Comprehension Levels of Learning Materials Utilized in Vocational Education
Project No. 50-71340-C-4-204, Part C Grant

Yuba Community College
Corrections Majors Casework with Probationers
Project No. 58-72777-D-3, Part D Grant

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

The following tables are included in this appendix:

Table		Page
B-1	Total Proposed Expenditures for Part C and Part D Projects	41
B-2	Part C Funds Awarded and Claimed	42
B-3	Part D Funds Awarded and Claimed	43
B-4	Number of Part C Awards Made and Funds Committed by Project Area	44
B-5	Number of Part D Awards Made and Funds Committed by Project Area	45
B-6	Major Problems Reported for Part C and Part D Projects	46
B-7	Local Funds Spent as Percentage of Total Project Expenditures	47
B-8	Suggestions for Changes or Improvements in Part C and Part D Regulations, Provisions, or Management	48
B-9	The Way Part C and Part D Funds Were Used	49
B-10	Reported Accomplishments of Part C and Part D Projects	50
B-11	Types of Products Produced by Part C and Part D Projects	51
B-12	Reported Evidence That the Projects Accomplished Their Stated Purposes	52

Table B-1

Total Proposed Expenditures for Part C and Part D Projects

Amount	Part C		Part D	
	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=38)
$ 3,001 to $ 15,000	6	15	3	8
$ 15,001 to $ 30,000	7	18	7	18
$ 30,001 to $ 45,000	13	32	11	29
$ 45,001 to $ 60,000	3	8	5	13
$ 60,001 to $ 75,000	3	8	1	3
$ 75,001 to $ 90,000	1	2	2	5
$ 90,001 to $105,000	1	2	1	3
$105,001 to $125,000	0	0	2	5
$125,001 to $140,000	1	2	0	0
Over $140,000	3	8	1	3
Information Not Available	2	5	5	13

Note. Total proposed expenditures include proposed local funds and requested federal funds

Table B-2

Part C Funds Awarded and Claimed

Amount	Funds Awarded		Funds Claimed	
	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=40)
$ 1,001 to $10,000	6	15	7	18
$10,001 to $20,000	7	18	5	12
$20,001 to $30,000	11	28	11	28
$30,001 to $40,000	6	15	5	12
$40,001 to $50,000	2	5	3	8
$50,001 to $60,000	0	0	1	2
$60,001 to $70,000	2	5	1	2
$70,001 to $80,000	2	5	2	5
$80,001 to $90,000	2	5	0	0
Over $90,000	2	5	0	0
Information Not Available	0	0	5	12

Table B-3

Part D Funds Awarded and Claimed

Amount	Funds Awarded		Funds Claimed	
	Number	Percent (N=38)	Number	Percent (N=38)
$ 4,001 to $10,000	3	8	2	5
$10,001 to $20,000	6	16	4	11
$20,001 to $30,000	8	21	6	16
$30,001 to $40,000	10	26	7	18
$40,001 to $50,000	6	16	2	5
$50,001 to $60,000	2	5	2	5
$60,001 to $70,000	3	8	1	3
Information Not Available	0	0	14	37

Table B-4

Number of Part C Awards Made and Funds Committed by Project Area

Project Area	Awards Made		Funds Committed	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
Career Education and Guidance[a]	3	8	$ 152,130	10
Students with Special Needs (Disadvantaged, Handicapped, and Older Adults)	5	12	134,223	9
Studies of Student Characteristics	4	10	104,258	7
Training of Vocational Educators (Teachers, Administrators, and Project Staff)	3	8	52,144	4
Instructional Techniques or Curriculum Development	5	12	76,367	5
Labor Market Supply and Demand Information	4	10	221, 637	15
Administration or Evaluation of Programs[b]	16	40	715,715	49
Sum	40	100	1,456,474	99

Note. Project areas are intended to cover vocational education research and development in general, and should not be confused with priority concerns for California vocational education research activities.

[a]Includes curriculum development in career education

[b]Includes both state and local level.

Table B-5

Number of Part D Awards Made and Funds Committed by Project Area

Project Area	Awards Made		Funds Committed	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
Career Education and Guidance[a]	14	37	$ 601,546[c]	48
Students with Special Needs (Disadvantaged, Handicapped, and Older Adults)	4	11	88,693	7
Studies of Student Characteristics	0	0	0	0
Training of Vocational Educators (Teachers, Administrators, and Project Staff)	1	3	40,000	3
Instructional Techniques or Curriculum Development	14	37	422,631	33
Labor Market Supply and Demand Information	2	5	74,952	6
Administration or Evaluation of Programs[b]	3	8	33,460	3
Sum	38	101	1,261,282	100

Note. Project areas are intended to cover vocational education research and development in general, and should not be confused with priority concerns for California vocational education research activities.

[a]Includes curriculum development in career education.

[b]Includes both state and local level.

[c]Includes $134,868 for two projects founded from Commissioner's Part D funds.

Table B-6

Major Problems Reported for Part C and Part D Projects

Problem	Part C		Part D	
	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=38)
Difficulty in Getting Study Sample or Data	15	38	0	0
Administrative Red Tape/ Lack of Administrative Support	0	0	9	24
Incompetent or Inadequate Staff	7	18	2	5
Difficulty in Getting Funds Processed or Late Funding	6	15	6	16
Unforeseen Time Requirements or Task Complexity	5	12	5	13
Problems with Participants (Philosophical Differences, Lack of Cooperation, Communication)	0	0	5	13
State Purchasing Procedures	0	0	4	11
Inadequate Funds	3	8	3	8
Other Problems	9	22	8	21
None Reported	8	20	11	29
Information Not Available	1	2	1	3

Note. Several projects reported more than one problem.

Table B-7

Local Funds Spent As Percentage of Total Project Expenditures

Percent	Part C		Part D	
	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=38)
0% (No Local Funds)	7	18	11	29
.1% to 9.9%	9	22	3	8
10%	5	12	0	0
11% to 20%	8	20	2	5
21% to 40%	3	8	4	11
41% to 60%	2	5	2	5
61% to 70%	0	0	1	3
71% to 80%	1	2	0	0
Information Not Available	5	12	15	39

Table B-8

Suggestions for Changes or Improvement in Part C and Part D Regulations, Provisions, or Management

Suggestion	Part C		Part D	
	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=38)
Earlier Funding	7	18	7	18
Longer Funding Period	2	5	8	21
Priority Should Be Set by Local Authorities or Field Personnel	4	10	2	5
Need More Publicity on Fund Availability, Eligibility, and Priority	3	8	4	11
Eliminate Political Consideration in Funding	3	8	1	3
State Evaluation Should be Conducted	3	8	1	3
Use of Money Is Too Highly Specified	0	0	3	8
Others	5	12	2	5
No Suggestions	15	38	9	24
Information Not Available	3	8	3	8

Note. Staff of several projects made more than one suggestion.

Table B-9

The Way Part C and Part D Funds Were Used

Way Funds Were Used	Part C		Part D	
	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=38)
Develop a New Program	7	18	21	55
Extend an Existing Program	5	12	8	21
Improve an Existing Program	19	48	5	13
Maintain an Existing Program	0	0	0	0
Develop and Extend	3	8	1	3
Develop and Improve	2	5	3	8
Extend and Improve	4	10	0	0

Table B-10

Reported Accomplishments of Part C and Part D Projects

Reported Accomplishment	Part C Number	Part C Percent (N=40)	Part D Number	Part D Percent (N=38)
Provided Information Helpful in Vocational Education Program Development	16	40	2	5
Developed or Implemented Vocational or Career Education Programs	1	2	13	34
Provided Training for Vocational Educators or Project Staff	8	20	9	24
Developed Information, Evaluation, or Follow-up Systems	12	30	5	13
Evaluated Vocational Education Programs or Placement Service Systems	6	15	11	29
Field Tested Innovative Techniques or Follow-up Systems	3	8	3	8
Information Not Available	3	8	10	26

Note. Several projects reported more than one accomplishment. Does not include products produced by projects, which are shown in Table B-11.

Table B-11

Types of Products Produced by Part C and Part D Projects

Type of Product	Part C		Part D	
	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=38)
Curricula, Curriculum Guides, or Curriculum Units	5	12	14	37
Systems for Collecting or Recording Vocational Education Information	3	8	0	0
Guides or Handbooks for Implementing Programs or Systems	9	22	2	5
Audiovisual Materials for Instruction or Dissemination	6	15	8	21
Printouts of Information (Manpower, Skill Needs, Job Descriptions, etc.)	4	10	1	3
Informational Brochures	0	0	5	13
No Products	14	35	9	24
Information Not Available	3	8	10	26

Note. Several projects had more than one product. Final reports are not included.

Table B-12

Reported Evidence that the Projects Accomplished Their Stated Purposes

Reported Evidence	Part C		Part D	
	Number	Percent (N=40)	Number	Percent (N=38)
Internal Advisory Committee or Project Staff Said Project Accomplished Purpose	18	45	16	42
Outside Evaluator or Evaluation Committee Said Project Accomplished Purpose	6	15	4	11
Promised Data, Products, or Other Project Outcomes Are Available	15	38	6	16
Project Products Were Adopted Elsewhere	7	18	5	13
Project or Program Continued at Site on Permanent or Expanded Basis	4	10	6	16
Participants Responded Favorably to Project	5	12	6	16
Project Resulted in Other Projects or Program Recommendations	8	20	3	8
Favorable Results Obtained on Statistical Comparisons	3	8	6	16
Project Had Impact on Attendance, Placement, or Curriculum Changes	3	8	5	13
Information Not Available	8	20	13	34

Note. A project may have reported more than one type of evidence.